



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

editions takes exception to the symbols  $\mathfrak{p} = gn$  in *regner*,  $\sigma = eu$  in *peu*;  $\mathfrak{œ} = eu$  in *peur*;  $\mathfrak{œ} =$  the nasal in *un*;  $\mathfrak{y} =$  the sound of French *u* in *pu*; and  $\mathfrak{u} = u$  in *suif*; for which sounds the authors substitute respectively  $\mathfrak{n}$ ,  $\mathfrak{o}$ ,  $\mathfrak{ö}$ ,  $\mathfrak{ö}$ ,  $\mathfrak{ü}$ , and  $\mathfrak{w}$ ; that is to say, symbols with diacritics over them. It may be well questioned whether in doing this they have made any improvement upon the alphabet as a whole. In regard to legibility, the characters substituted are somewhat more easily decipherable, which is so much in their favor. On the other hand, the beauty of the A. P. I. alphabet is that, with the exception of the symbols for the nasals and possibly  $\sigma$ , it can be written quite rapidly without removing continually the pen in order to insert diacritics. The case here cited is brought up simply to illustrate just what particular symbols occasion the most dissatisfaction. It is not my belief that this alphabet is so well adopted to other idioms—notably English—as to French. Nevertheless, it is being used in an international way more extensively than any other system, witness in this country, Professor Hempl's series of *Ideophonic Texts*. Articles, too, embodying the results of dialect-research are frequently recorded by means of the A. P. I. alphabet. In addition to the symbols already mentioned, the signs  $\mathfrak{j} = y$  in *yeux*,  $\mathfrak{f} = ch$  in *chat*, have not infrequently been tabooed. In addition to the present text, what has done more than any other material published in this country to make generally known the admirable system of French phonetic transcription advocated by Messrs. Passy and Rambeau, is the use of it *without a single modification* in the Fraser and Squair *French Grammar*. It is fortunate for the success of the system, which is almost practically assured, that it has been made known throughout the United States and Canada by means of so favorable a medium.

The second edition of the *Chrestomathie* is typographically clearer than the first edition; æsthetically, as regards book-making, it is also superior. The many mistakes in printing that occurred in the first edition and that are practically unavoidable in the preparation of a like work, have been reduced to a minimum. Although the divergence in type, to indicate the phrase intonation, slightly mars the general appearance of the page, the obvious advantage derived from this device is more

than an adequate compensation. The selections are well chosen in that they are both entertaining and very well adapted for the purpose in view. M. Rambeau has done well in adhering, in the body of the text itself, to the original paging of the first edition. The bibliography, which forms a part of the luminous introduction to the work, has been brought down to date and is very useful. Professor Rambeau has dedicated the volume to his lamented colleague Jean Passy, whose loss is sincerely mourned by scholars and particularly by those to whom the cause of phonetics is dear.

J. GEDDES, JR.

Boston University.

### LA CHANSON DE ROLAND IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF FRANCE.

MAURICE BOUCHOR, *La Chanson de Roland traduite en vers à l'usage des écoles normales, lycées et collèges, écoles primaires supérieures, cours complémentaires*. Paris, 1901.

France is no longer ignorant of her epic poetry. The process of vulgarization which was very slow at first has been greatly accelerated in recent years, and at present, as may be seen by the title of the work mentioned above, the national epic has found its way even into the schools of the people. Léon Gautier who spent his life in the twofold labor of giving a critical text of the *Roland*, and in popularizing the national epic poetry, wrote in the last edition of his *Épopées Françaises*: "*nous voulons tout faire servir à la vulgarisation de notre vieux poème, et nous ne nous estimerons satisfaits que le jour où il sera aussi populaire qu'au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle.*" His desire is being realized to-day with a rapidity that would surprise the scholars who resurrected a literature long forgotten, and unknown even in its native country. For a quarter of a century after the publication of the Oxford text of the *Chanson de Roland* it was known to only a few savants. Prior to 1865 but three translations, or more properly *rajeunissements*, were made, and none of them, entirely worthy of the subject.<sup>1</sup> In 1865 Alex. de Saint-Albin published a prose translation which in 1880 had

<sup>1</sup> Décluze, 1845; Genin, 1850; Jonain, 1861.

reached a fourth edition. In 1870 Alfred Lehuguer published a *rajeunissement* in verse, and not long afterwards Léon Gautier<sup>2</sup> brought out his first edition which contained both the text and translation on opposite pages. In 1878 the late Professor Petit de Julleville published a metrical version in which he discarded rhyme and imitated the assonance of the original *Roland*. Notwithstanding the merit of the work, the utility of reproducing a form of versification unfamiliar to modern ears may well be doubted. The only object of a translation is to render a literature, inaccessible in its original form, appreciable to the general public. It is the spirit of the work that the translator should try to reproduce, the form can be appreciated fully only in the original.

Up to this time the translations of the *Roland* were all designed only for the literary public. Now another and more advanced step has been taken in the popularization. In 1881 the translation of Gautier was published without the text, but with illustrations. This innovation was soon followed by others who, to make the work more accessible to the young, made translations of only the principal incidents, but linked them together so as to conserve the spirit of the poem and leave the story complete. The earliest of these editions destined particularly for the young is that of Feuilleret.<sup>3</sup> Another version destined for the same public was published by Édouard Roehrich in 1885. It is partly in verse, partly in prose, the author taking that method of preserving the story and versifying only the more dramatic portions. The version recently made by M. Bouchor, and which is the excuse for this article, is therefore no innovation, but simply the evolution of a method inaugurated more than twenty years ago.

During this period two acts of school legislation have completely changed the position of *La Chanson de Roland* in educational circles. At first the professors of literature in the secondary schools scorned the medieval epics. They were ably seconded by the classical critics for whom French

literature dates from Malherbe. Notwithstanding this indifference or open criticism, in 1878 the council of public instruction passed an act requiring the candidates for the *agrégation des classes supérieures et des classes de grammaire* to pass an examination in *La Chanson de Roland*. This was the first introduction of the old epic literature into the schools, but it only concerned the teachers. The second act, passed in 1886, added *La Chanson de Roland* to the number of French classics to be taught in the upper classes of the *Lycées*. This was a step of much greater significance, and necessitated new material of instruction. Even if it were advisable to teach the language of the eleventh century to students of that grade, the great mass of the teachers were unable to perform the task creditably. But such was not the purpose of the act. The design was to teach the literature of the *Roland*, but not the language, at least not in the philological sense. The best means, therefore, was to make the poem known to the pupils by a *rajeunissement* that would convey as nearly as possible the heroic spirit, and supplement that with oral explanations.

Such is the method recommended by Léon Gautier, to whom is due in large measure the introduction of the subject into the curriculum of the secondary schools:

“La meilleure façon d’enseigner notre vieux poème, ce serait, suivant nous, de le lire à haute voix devant les élèves; ce serait de le lire en une traduction claire, colorée et chaude, au lieu d’aborder le texte original, dont l’accès est encore trop malaisé aux débutants.

Donc, le professeur divisera le Roland en un certain nombre d’épisodes qu’il lira l’un après l’autre et commentera oralement, etc.”

The translation of M. Bouchor is designed for the same method of teaching the old epic to the young. It is in verse and while the author is not perhaps a great poet he has imbibed the spirit of his original, and reproduces well the epic tone. The form of his versification is worthy of note, and may be due to the influence of the modern school.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This continues to be the standard school text. In 1878 a revision by the author made it thoroughly critical, and in 1887 another revision fitted it for use in secondary schools.

<sup>3</sup> *La Chanson de Roland. Traduction, réduite et annotée pour la jeunesse, par H. Feuilleret. Limoges. Preface dated 1877.*

<sup>4</sup> Such is the natural conclusion to be drawn from the following: “. . . je n’ai eu aucun scrupule, en rimant pour l’oreille, à ne pas rimer toujours exactement pour l’œil. D’autre part, j’ai accepté un hiatus indispensable (tu es), et j’en eusse admis bien d’autres sans remords, la règle qui proscriit l’hiatus n’ayant, à mon avis, qu’une utilité très relative, et discutable suivant les cas.” Note 1, p. 161.

*A priori* one would suppose that in the rendition of a heroic poem the translator would choose the national heroic verse, the alexandrin. On the contrary, M. Bouchor has chosen quite a different meter, the eight line stanza of Villon, with verses of ten syllables. It is a *mouvement* certainly much more capable of rendering the fire, elasticity and spontaneity of the old epic than the stately swing of the alexandrin.

The translation is approximately complete but makes no claim to being literal. Here again the author has a correct idea considering the purpose of the work. In general a *laisse* long or short is rendered by a stanza, but sometimes two or more stanzas are devoted to a single *laisse*.

Since the original *Roland* was composed not to be read but to be recited, M. Bouchor has made his version with the same purpose in view. Each of the three classic divisions of the poem, the treachery, the disaster, and the punishment is subdivided into a considerable number of scenes, or tableaux; the first contains ten, the second eighteen, the third nine. As many of the scenes are more or less episodic, some may be omitted or summarized in a word by the reader, if the time at his disposal is not sufficient for the recital of the entire work. This arrangement and the detailed recommendations of the translator<sup>6</sup> reveal another use of the old epic which has already come into vogue, namely popular readings for the general public, or before literary clubs.

All this indicates a popularization of the *Roland* that surpasses the expectation of its most ardent admirers, and is something new and unique in modern education. Not since the days of the ancient Greeks has a national epic received such a place in the literary education of a people. It is for this reason solely that the work of M. Bouchor deserves a brief mention. It will aid in the vulgarization of the *Roland* and that is the only purpose of the author. For the few notes, explanations and the short glossary which accompany his version he claims no originality. He has simply borrowed from the learned editions of the poem the explanations, historical, philological and archeological which are necessary for an intelligent reading.

EDGAR E. BRANDON.

Paris.

<sup>6</sup> P. 163 ff.

## SPANISH THEATRE.

*Nuevos Datos acerca del Histrionismo Español en los Siglos XVI y XVII*, recogidos por D. CRISTÓBAL PÉREZ PASTOR. Madrid: Imprenta de la Revista Española, 1901. 16<sup>mo</sup>.

Dr. Cristóbal Pérez Pastor, one of the best known among the Spanish scholars of to-day, a distinguished bibliographer and worthy successor of Gallardo and LaBarrera, here presents us with another important volume, though this time it is quite a small one. His patient and painstaking investigations in the Archives of Madrid and other cities have enriched our knowledge of Spanish literature with a mass of almost invaluable facts concerning the lives of some of the greatest literary men of the golden age of Spanish letters, witness his *Documentos Cervantinos* (of which a *Segunda Parte* is promised soon to appear), and his *Proceso de Lope de Vega por Libelos contra unos Cómicos*, the latter lighting up many dark corners in the life of Spain's greatest dramatic poet, and clearing away more than one of the many mysteries that have enveloped the singular career of this most mysterious genius.

The present little volume concerns itself wholly with the Spanish Theatre, its actors and actresses, and its managers or *autores*; and though it does not purport to be a history of the Spanish stage, it is infinitely more valuable in some respects than the confused and shambling work of Casiano Pellicer, and furnishes abundant material for the future writer who shall undertake the task of chronicling the history and development of the Spanish stage. To anyone who is interested in the great Lope de Vega, or in Tirso or Calderon, and the actors who first produced their immortal *comedias*, there is much that is exceedingly interesting in these *Nuevos Datos*. Here we get the first really reliable information concerning the compensation received by the players during this greatest period of the Spanish drama. We learn, for instance, that Maria Calderon, *La bella Calderona*, the mother of one of the sons of Philip IV, received on December 7, 1632, ten hundred and fifty reales for appearing in two *autos* and two *comedias* in the town of Pinto on two successive days; and that Maria de Córdoba or *Amarilis*, as she was called, the wife of the *autor* Andres de la Vega,